



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Stewart M. Smith,

Plaintiff,

-against-

AECOM Tishman et al.,

Defendants.

1:21-cv-02915 (PGG) (SDA)

ORDER

STEWART D. AARON, United States Magistrate Judge:

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2023, Plaintiff filed a motion to amend the Complaint, which included a proposed Amended Complaint (*see* Mot. to Amend, ECF No. 58); and

WHEREAS, on July 31, 2023, Defendants filed a response to Plaintiff's motion, which actually is an Answer to Plaintiff's proposed Amended Complaint (*see* Response, ECF No. 62).

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff's motion to amend is GRANTED.<sup>1</sup>

The Clerk of Court is respectfully requested to file ECF No. 58 as a new docket entry titled Amended Complaint<sup>2</sup> and to file ECF No. 62 as a subsequent docket entry titled Answer.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: New York, New York  
August 1, 2023

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Stewart D. Aaron".

STEWART D. AARON  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> A magistrate judge's grant of a motion to amend a complaint is generally considered non-dispositive. *See Antipova v. Caremount Med. P.C.*, No. 21-CV-07453 (JPC) (BCM), 2022 WL 17820862, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. June 16, 2022) (citing cases).

<sup>2</sup> The Court agrees with Defendants that the "timeline" portion of ECF No. 51 is not part of the Amended Complaint, which begins following the heading "Exhibit A." (*See* ECF No. 51 at 1-2.)